arXiv:1611.07455v1 [quant-ph] 22 Nov 2016

Revisit of Strong Subadditivity: A Quantum Correlation Approach

Razieh Taghiabadi,[1] Seyed Javad Akhtarshenas,[1,*] and Mohsen Sarbishaei[1]

[1] *Department of Physics, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran*

The strong subadditivity inequality of von Neumann entropy relates the entropy of subsystems of a tripartite state ρ_{ABC} to that of the composite system. Here, we define $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ as the extent to which ρ_{ABC} fails to satisfy the strong subadditivity inequality $S(\rho_B)+S(\rho_C) \leq S(\rho_{AB})+S(\rho_{AC})$ with equality and investigate its properties. In particular, by introducing auxiliary subsystem E, we consider any purification $|\psi_{ABCE}\rangle$ of ρ_{ABC} and formulate $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ as the extent to which the bipartite quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC}, measured by entanglement of formation and quantum discord, change under the transformation $B \to BE$ and $C \to CE$. Invariance of quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} under such transformation is shown to be a necessary and sufficient condition for vanishing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$. Our approach allows one to characterize, intuitively, the structure of states for which the strong subadditivity is saturated. Moreover, along with providing a conservation law for quantum correlations of states for which the strong subadditivity inequality is satisfied with equality, we find that such states coincides with those that the Koashi-Winter monogamy relation is saturated.

Introduction.—Correlations between different subsystems of a classical or quantum composite system result to inequalities relating the entropy of various subsystems to that of the composite system. For a given state ρ_{AB} of the quantum system $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, consisting of two subsystems $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, the *subadditivity* (SA) states that [1]

$$S(\rho_{AB}) \leq S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B), \tag{1}$$

where $\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$ and $\rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$ are states of the subsystems and $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}\rho\log\rho$ is the von Neumann entropy of ρ. The inequality implies that any correlation between subsystems decreases the amount of information needed to specify one of the subsystems once we know the other one [2]. The equality holds if and only if the subsystems are uncorrelated, i.e., $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$. It turns out therefore that the extent to which the state ρ_{AB} fails to satisfy the SA with equality is a measure of total correlations (classical+quantum) and is defined as the *mutual information* [3]

$$I(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}). \tag{2}$$

A stronger inequality holds when the composite system is composed of three subsystems. Suppose ρ_{ABC} is a quantum state of the composite system $\mathcal{H}_{ABC} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$. The *strong subadditivity* (SSA), which was conjectured for quantum systems by Lanford and Robinson [4] and proved by Lieb and Ruskai [5], states that

$$S(\rho_{ABC}) + S(\rho_C) \leq S(\rho_{AC}) + S(\rho_{BC}). \tag{3}$$

Clearly, by choosing $\mathcal{H}_C = \mathbb{C}$, Eq. (3) recovers the subadditivity relation (1). The SSA inequality (3) is equivalent to

$$S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C) \leq S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AC}), \tag{4}$$

which can be seen by adding an auxiliary subsystem $\mathcal{H}_E$ such that ρ_{ABCE} is a pure state. The SSA inequality plays a crucial role in quantum information theory. It appears almost everywhere in quantum information theory from Holevo bound on the accessible information in the quantum ensemble [6–8], properties of coherent information [9–11], definition of squashed entanglement [12, 13], monogamy of quantum correlations [14–16], to some features of quantum discord such as condition for nullity [17], and condition for saturating the upper bound [18]. Note that the SSA inequality (4) can be written also as [3]

$$0 \leq S_{\rho_{AB}}(A \mid B) + S_{\rho_{AC}}(A \mid C), \tag{5}$$

where

$$S_{\rho_{AB}}(A \mid B) = S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_B), \tag{6}$$

is the *quantum conditional entropy* which, unlike its classical counterpart, can take negative values. This latter form of SSA emphasises how highly SSA is nontrivial in the quantum case in a sense that although each term on the right-hand side of (5) can be negative, both of them cannot be negative simultaneously.

Contrary to the SA inequality, the characterization of states for which the SSA is saturated is not trivial. Obviously, when the global state is factorized, i.e., $\rho_{ABC} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B \otimes \rho_C$, the equality (3) holds but the converse is not true in general. Petz [19] and Ruskai [20] have provided algebraic criteria to check that if any given state satisfies the inequality with equality, however, their description do not characterize the structure of such states. An important progress in providing the structure of states for which the SSA inequality is satisfied with equality is given in Ref. [21]. Hayden *et al.* have shown that the state ρ_{ABC} satisfies the SSA inequality (3) with equality if and only if there is a decomposition of the subsystem $\mathcal{H}_C$ into a direct orthogonal sum of tensor products as $\mathcal{H}_C = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{H}_{C_j^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_j^R}$ such that $\rho_{ABC} = \bigoplus_j q_j \rho_{AC_j^L} \otimes \rho_{C_j^R B}$, with states $\rho_{AC_j^L}$ on

* akhtarshenas@um.ac.ir

$\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_j^L}$ and $\rho_{C_j^R B}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{C_j^R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, and a probability distribution $\{q_j\}$. On the basis of the results of [21], the structure of states for which the SSA inequality (4) is saturated is given in [22].

As it is mentioned above any deviation of SA from equality refers to some correlations existing in the bipartite state. It is therefore natural to ask the question: Is it possible to express deviation from equality of the SSA inequality (4) to the existence of some kind of correlations. In this Letter we address this issue and define the quantity $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ as the extent to which the SSA inequality (4) deviates from equality in terms of two different aspects of quantum correlations, i.e., entanglement of formation (EOF) [23] and quantum discord (QD) [24, 25]. Our main results are Theorems 3 and 5 and also Corollary 6. To be specific, Theorem 3 shows that $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ can be expressed by means of the extent to which the bipartite quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC}, measured by EOF and QD, change under the transformation $B \to BE$ and $C \to CE$, where E is an auxiliary subsystem that purifies ρ_{ABC}. In Theorem 5, we use this measure and characterize the structure of states for which the SSA inequality (4) is satisfied with equality. Our approach provides an information-theoretic aspect for such states, that is, $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ if and only if quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} do not change under the above transformation. This, however, can be regarded as a kind of conservation law for quantum correlations, i.e., if $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ then the sum of entanglement of formation of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} is equal to the sum of their quantum discord. Moreover, we find that the class of states saturating the Koashi-Winter inequality (10) coincides with those states that the SSA inequality is satisfied with equality.

Monogamy of quantum correlations.—Quantum entanglement and quantum discord are two aspects of quantum correlations defined respectively within entanglement-separability paradigm and an information-theoretic perspective. Quantum entanglement is defined as those correlations that cannot be generated by local operations and classical communication [26]. Several measures have been proposed to quantify quantum entanglement, the most important one is the *entanglement of formation* (EOF) [27], defined for a bipartite state ρ_{AB} as

$$E(\rho) = \min \sum_i p_i E(\psi_i), \tag{7}$$

where minimum is taken over all pure state decompositions $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ and $E(\psi_i) = S(\mathrm{Tr}_B[|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|])$. However, quantum entanglement cannot capture all nonclassical correlations of a composite state in a sense that a composite mixed state may exhibit some quantum correlations even if it is disentangled. From various measures proposed for this different aspect of quantum correlation, *quantum discord* (QD) has received a great deal of attention. For a bipartite state ρ_{AB}, quantum discord is defined as the difference between two classically equivalent but quantum mechanically different definitions of quantum mutual information

$$D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) = I(\rho_{AB}) - J^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}), \tag{8}$$

where $J^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) = \max_{\{\Pi_i^B\}} J^{\{\Pi_i^B\}}(\rho_{AB})$ is the classical correlation of the state ρ_{AB}. Moreover [24]

$$J^{\{\Pi_i^B\}}(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_A) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_{AB}|\Pi_i^B), \tag{9}$$

where $\{\Pi_i^B\}$ is the set of projection operators on the subsystem B, and $S(\rho_{AB}|\Pi_i^B)$ is the conditional entropy of A when measurement is performed on B and the i-th outcome is obtained with probability $p_i = \mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_i^B \rho_{AB} \Pi_i^B]$. We notice here that QD is not, in general, symmetric under the swap of the two parties, $A \leftrightarrow B$.

For a general tripartite state ρ_{ABC} there exists a monogamic relation between EOF and QD of its corresponding bipartite mixed states, the so-called Koashi-Winter (K-W) relation [14]

$$E(\rho_{AB}) \le D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC}) + S_{\rho_{AC}}(A \mid C). \tag{10}$$

When ρ_{ABC} is pure, the inequality is saturated and ρ_{ABC} is called a purification of the mixed states ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC}. In this case the state ρ_{AC} is called B-complement to ρ_{AB} and, similarly, ρ_{AB} is called C-complement to ρ_{AC}. For this particular case of pure global state ρ_{ABC}, the following *quantum conservation law*, as it is called by Fanchini *et al.* [15], is obtained

$$E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC}) = D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) + D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC}). \tag{11}$$

Deviation from equality of Strong subadditivity.—Let $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ denotes the degree to which ρ_{ABC} fails to saturate SSA, i.e., the difference between the right-hand side and the left-hand side of Eq. (4)

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AC}) - S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_C). \tag{12}$$

Then the following Lemma states that $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ is a concave function of its input state ρ_{ABC}.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $\{p_k, \rho_{ABC}^k\}_k$ is an ensemble of states generating ρ_{ABC}, that is, $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_k^K p_k \rho_{ABC}^k$. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) \ge \sum_k^K p_k \boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}^k). \tag{13}$$

Moreover, the equality holds if the marginal states $\{\rho_B^k\}_k$ and $\{\rho_C^k\}_k$ are mutually orthogonal, i.e., $\rho_B^k \perp \rho_B^{k'}$ and $\rho_C^k \perp \rho_C^{k'}$ for $k \neq k'$.

Proof. For state $\rho = \sum_k^K p_k \rho^k$, acting on $\mathcal{H}$, define the *Holevo quantity* $\chi_\rho = S(\rho) - \sum_k p_k S(\rho^k)$. The inequality (13) then easily obtained by noting that for any bipartite state ρ_{AB} we have $\chi_{\rho_{AB}} \ge \chi_{\rho_B}$ [3, 7] (For a different proof of (13) see Ref. [3]). For the second claim of the Lemma note that for any state $\rho = \sum_k p_k \rho^k$ we have

$S\left(\sum_k p_k\rho^k\right) \leq H(p_k)+\sum_k p_k S(\rho^k)$, with equality if and only if the states $\{\rho^k\}_k$ have support in orthogonal subspaces $\mathcal{H}_k$ of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \mathcal{H}_k$ [3], i.e., they are mutually orthogonal in a sense that $\rho^k \perp \rho^{k'}$ for $k \neq k'$. Using this we find that the orthogonality condition for the marginal states $\{\rho^k_{AB}\}_k$, $\{\rho^k_{AC}\}_k$, $\{\rho^k_B\}_k$, and $\{\rho^k_C\}_k$ implies the equality of the inequality (13). The proof becomes complete if recalling that for any two bipartite states ρ_{AB} and ρ'_{AB}, the orthogonality of parts implies the orthogonality of whole, i.e., $\rho_B \perp \rho'_B$ implies $\rho_{AB} \perp \rho'_{AB}$. □

The following corollary is immediately obtained from Lemma 1.

Corollary 2. *(i) Let ρ_{ABC} be a state with vanishing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$. Then for any ensemble $\{p_k, \rho^k_{ABC}\}_k$ giving rise to ρ_{ABC} we have $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho^k_{ABC}) = 0$ for $k = 1, \cdots, K$. (ii) Moreover, any ensemble $\{p_k, \rho^k_{ABC}\}_k$ with $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho^k_{ABC}) = 0$ generates a state $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_k^K p_k\rho^k_{ABC}$ with $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ provided that the marginal states $\{\rho^k_B\}_k$ and $\{\rho^k_C\}_k$ are mutually orthogonal.*

Strong subadditivity versus quantum correlations.— Consider two bipartite states ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} with the same tripartite extension ρ_{ABC}, i.e., $\rho_{AB} = \mathrm{Tr}_C(\rho_{ABC})$ and $\rho_{AC} = \mathrm{Tr}_B(\rho_{ABC})$. Let $|\psi_{ABCE}\rangle$ be any purification of ρ_{ABC}, where E is an auxiliary subsystem. Define $\widetilde{B} = BE$ and $\widetilde{C} = CE$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{B}} = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{C}} = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. Armed with these definitions, let us apply the K-W relation (10) to the pure states $\rho_{AB\widetilde{C}}$ and $\rho_{A\widetilde{B}C}$ and the mixed state ρ_{ABC} to get

$$E(\rho_{AB}) = D^{(\widetilde{C})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}) + S_{\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}}(A \mid \widetilde{C}), \tag{14}$$

$$E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) = D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC}) + S_{\rho_{AC}}(A \mid C), \tag{15}$$

$$E(\rho_{AB}) \leq D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC}) + S_{\rho_{AC}}(A \mid C). \tag{16}$$

The same relations hold if we exchange $B \leftrightarrow C$; denoting them with (14′), (15′), and (16′), respectively. Theorem 3 provides a relation for $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ in terms of quantum correlations.

Theorem 3. *$\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ can be expressed in terms of the quantum correlations of the aforementioned bipartite states*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) \\
&= \left[E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) - E(\rho_{AB})\right] + \left[D^{(\widetilde{C})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}) - D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC})\right] \\
&= \left[E(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}) - E(\rho_{AC})\right] + \left[D^{(\widetilde{B})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) - D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB})\right] \\
&= \left[E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) + E(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}})\right] - \left[D(\rho_{AB}) + D(\rho_{AC})\right] \\
&= \left[D(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) + D(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}})\right] - \left[E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC})\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Moreover

$$\delta^{(a)}_x(E) = E(\rho_{A\widetilde{X}}) - E(\rho_{AX}) \geq 0, \tag{18}$$

for $X = B, C$.

Proof. By subtracting Eq. (14) from (15), and using that for any pure state ρ_{XYZ} one can write $S_{\rho_{XZ}}(X \mid Z) = -S_{\rho_{XY}}(X \mid Y)$, we find the first equality of Eq. (17). The third equality is obtained by adding Eq. (15) to (15′). The second and fourth equalities are obtained just by swapping $B \leftrightarrow C$. Moreover, the nonnegativity of Eq. (18) follows easily by subtracting Eq. (16) from (15). □

Theorem (3) claims that for a given ρ_{ABC} with *a prior* bipartite quantum correlations of A with other subsystems B and C, $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ quantifies the increased quantum correlations caused by the transformations $B \to \widetilde{B} = BE$ and $C \to \widetilde{C} = CE$. This feature of $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ allows one to find, along with other results, the structure of states for which $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ achieves its upper or lower bounds. For the former, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) &\leq \max\left[E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) + E(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}})\right] \\
&\quad - \min\left[D(\rho_{AB}) + D(\rho_{AC})\right] \\
&\leq 2S(\rho_A) \leq 2\log d_A,
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which obtained from the third equality of Eq. (17) and the fact that for any bipartite state ρ_{XY}, we have $E(\rho_{XY}) \leq \min\{S(\rho_X), S(\rho_Y)\}$ and $D^{(Y)}(\rho_{XY}) \geq 0$. A simple investigation shows that the last inequality is saturated if and only if

$$\rho_{ABC} = \mathbb{I}_{d_A}/d_A \otimes \rho_{BC}, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{d_A}$ denotes the unity matrix of $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $d_A = \dim \mathcal{H}_A$. This follows from the fact that the minimum in Eq. (19) is obtained when the prior quantum discord of A with B and C are zero, and the maximum is achieved when the transformed states $\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}$ and $\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}$ are maximally entangled states. Both extermums will be attained simultaneously if and only if ρ_A is maximally mixed state and factorized from the rest of the system, so that A does not possess any prior correlation with B and C at all. Although Eq. (20) can be obtained by means of Eqs. (1) and (5), the above investigation shows the role of quantum correlations more clearly.

Conditions for $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$.—Theorem 3 states that a state satisfies SSA with equality if and only if the quantum correlations of A with B and C do not change under the transformation $B \to \widetilde{B}$ and $C \to \widetilde{C}$. This happens, in particular, whenever ρ_{ABC} is pure, but this is not the only case that $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ vanishes. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that any state of the form $\rho_{ABC} = |\psi_{AY}\rangle\langle\psi_{AY}| \otimes \rho_Z$ possesses quantum correlations which are invariant under transformations $B \to \widetilde{B}$ and $C \to \widetilde{C}$.

Lemma 4. *Let Y be a partition of BC and Z its complement, i.e., $\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$. More precisely, let $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_C$ can be tensor producted as $\mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_{B^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B^R}$ and $\mathcal{H}_C = \mathcal{H}_{C^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C^R}$, respectively, and define $\mathcal{H}_Y = \mathcal{H}_{B^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C^L}$ and $\mathcal{H}_Z = \mathcal{H}_{B^R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C^R}$. Then for any state of the form*

$$\rho_{ABC} = |\psi_{AY}\rangle\langle\psi_{AY}| \otimes \rho_Z, \tag{21}$$

we have $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$.

Proof. Recall that purification produces entanglement between the system under consideration and the auxiliary system if and only if the original system is impure [3]. Any purification of ρ_{ABC} leads to a purification of ρ_Z as $\rho_{\widetilde{Z}}$ where $\widetilde{Z} = ZE$ for the auxiliary subsystem E. In turn, it change ρ_{ABC} to $\rho_{ABCE} = |\psi_{AY}\rangle\langle\psi_{AY}| \otimes \rho_{\widetilde{Z}}$. Clearly, this does not create any correlation between the first and the second part of ρ_{ABC}. □

Although the above Lemma provides a sufficient condition for equality of SSA, it is not necessary in general. However, it provides building blocks for the structure of states for which the SSA inequality is satisfied with equality. Indeed, for a fixed pure state $|\psi_{AY}\rangle$, it is not difficult to see that the set of states with structure given by Eq. (21) forms a convex subset of the set of all states. It follows therefore that *only* ensembles of the form $\{p_k, |\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^k_{AY_k}| \otimes \rho^k_{Z_k}\}_k$ can realize a state with $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$. Theorem 5 provides the necessary and sufficient conditions on Y_k and Z_k, in order to achieve states with $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$.

Theorem 5. *For a given ρ_{ABC} we have $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ if and only if ρ_{ABC} can be expressed as*

$$\rho_{ABC} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_k \rho^k_{ABC}, \tag{22}$$

such that the marginal states $\{\rho^k_B\}_k$ and $\{\rho^k_C\}_k$ are mutually orthogonal and ρ^k_{ABC} has the following form

$$\rho^k_{ABC} = |\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^k_{AY_k}| \otimes \rho^k_{Z_k}. \tag{23}$$

Here ρ^k_{ABC} is defined on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_k}$, and Y_k is a partition of B_kC_k and Z_k denotes its complement in such a way that $\mathcal{H}_{Y_k} = \mathcal{H}_{B^L_k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C^L_k}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{Z_k} = \mathcal{H}_{B^R_k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C^R_k}$.

Proof. The sufficient condition is a simple consequence of Corollary 2-(ii) and Lemma 4. To prove the necessary condition, let ρ_{ABC} be a state such that $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$. It follows from Corollary 2-(i) that $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_k p_k \rho^k_{ABC}$ implies $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho^k_{ABC}) = 0$ for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, as such, ρ^k_{ABC} takes the form given by (23). It remains only to prove that $\rho^k_B \perp \rho^{k'}_B$ and $\rho^k_C \perp \rho^{k'}_C$ for $k \neq k'$. Using the spectral decomposition $\rho^k_{Z_k} = \sum_{i_k} \mu^{i_k}_k |\mu^{i_k}_{Z_k}\rangle\langle\mu^{i_k}_{Z_k}|$ and introducing the auxiliary subsystem E with an orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H}_E = \bigoplus_k^K \mathcal{H}_{E_k}$ and corresponding orthonormal basis $\{|\lambda^{i_k}_{E_k}\rangle\}_{i_k}$, for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, we arrive at the following purification for ρ_{ABC}

$$|\Psi_{ABCE}\rangle = \sum_{k}^{K} \sqrt{p_k} |\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle \otimes |\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle, \tag{24}$$

where $|\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle = \sum_{i_k} \sqrt{\mu^{i_k}_k} |\mu^{i_k}_{Z_k}\rangle |\lambda^{i_k}_{E_k}\rangle$. Tracing out C and defining $\widetilde{B} = BE$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{A\widetilde{B}} &= \sum_{k,k'}^{K} \sqrt{p_k p_{k'}} \mathrm{Tr}_C \left[|\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^{k'}_{AY_{k'}}| \otimes |\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle\langle\phi^{k'}_{Z_{k'}E_{k'}}| \right] \\
&= \sum_{k\neq k'}^{K} \sqrt{p_k p_{k'}} \mathrm{Tr}_C \left[|\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^{k'}_{AY_{k'}}| \otimes |\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle\langle\phi^{k'}_{Z_{k'}E_{k'}}| \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k}^{K} p_k \sigma^k_{AB^L_k} \otimes \varrho^k_{B^R_kE_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here we have defined $\sigma^k_{AB^L_k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{C^L_k} |\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^k_{AY_k}|$ and $\varrho^k_{B^R_kE_k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{C^R_k} \left[|\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle\langle\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}| \right]$ as states on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B^L_k}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B^R_k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, respectively. Now, tracing out C from ρ_{ABC} of Eq. (22), we get

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{k}^{K} p_k \sigma^k_{AB^L_k} \otimes \varrho^k_{B^R_k}, \tag{26}$$

where $\varrho^k_{B^R_k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{C^R_k} \rho^k_{Z_k}$. Comparing this with $\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}$ given by Eq. (25), one can easily see that $E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) = E(\rho_{AB})$ if and only if $\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}$ can be written as

$$\rho_{A\widetilde{B}} = \sum_{k}^{K} p_k \sigma^k_{AB^L_k} \otimes \varrho^k_{B^R_kE_k}. \tag{27}$$

This happens if and only if the first term of the second equality of (25) vanishes, i.e., $\mathrm{Tr}_C \left[|\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^{k'}_{AY_{k'}}| \otimes |\phi^k_{Z_kE_k}\rangle\langle\phi^{k'}_{Z_{k'}E_{k'}}| \right] = 0$. This, in turn implies $\rho^k_C \perp \rho^{k'}_C$ for $k \neq k'$, where $\rho^k_C = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}[|\psi^k_{AY_k}\rangle\langle\psi^k_{AY_k}| \otimes |\mu^{i_k}_{Z_k}\rangle\langle\mu^{i_k}_{Z_k}|]$ and $\rho^{k'}_C$ is defined similarly. In a same manner we find that the condition $E(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}) = E(\rho_{AC})$ leads to $\rho^k_B \perp \rho^{k'}_B$ for $k \neq k'$. Using this, it follows that $D^{(\widetilde{B})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) = D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB})$, which completes the proof. □

The following Corollary is immediately obtained from Theorem 5.

Corollary 6. *(i) ρ_{ABC} satisfies the SSA inequality* (4) *with equality if and only if it satisfies the Koashi-Winter relation* (10) *with equality, i.e., $S(\rho_B)+S(\rho_C) = S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AC})$ implies $E(\rho_{AB}) = D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC}) + S_\rho(A \mid C)$ and $E(\rho_{AC}) = D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) + S_\rho(A \mid B)$, and vice versa.*
(ii) If ρ_{ABC} satisfies the SSA inequality (4) *with equality then it satisfies the quantum conservation law, i.e., $S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C) = S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AC})$ implies $E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC}) = D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) + D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC})$.*

Note that we have considered only situation that the SSA inequality is saturated identically. Indeed, as it is clear from the first line of Eq. (17), vanishing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ may happen even for nonzero $E(\rho_{A\widetilde{B}}) - E(\rho_{AB})$, due to the possibility that $D^{(\widetilde{C})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{C}}) - D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC})$ takes negative value. This *approximate* case that a state *almost* saturates SSA inequality is also addressed in Ref.

[21] for the SSA inequality (3), and it is proved in [28] that in this case ρ_{ABC} is well approximated by structure given in [21]. However, a look at Eq. (17) shows that such approximate case does not happen if $\delta_x^{(a)}(D) = D^{(\widetilde{X})}(\rho_{A\widetilde{X}}) - D^{(X)}(\rho_{AX}) \geq 0$ for at least one choice of $X = B, C$. For example, when the conservation law holds then $\delta_B^{(a)}(E) + \delta_C^{(a)}(E) = \delta_B^{(a)}(D) + \delta_C^{(a)}(D)$, implies that both $\delta_B^{(a)}(D)$ and $\delta_C^{(a)}(D)$ cannot be negative.

Conclusion.—We have defined $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ as the extent to which the tripartite state ρ_{ABC} fails to saturate SSA inequality. An important feature of our approach is the possibility of writing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ as the amount by which the bipartite quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} change under the transformation $B \to \widetilde{B} = BE$ and $C \to \widetilde{C} = CE$, with E as an auxiliary subsystem purifying ρ_{ABC}. It turns out that the more contribution A inherits from purification of ρ_{ABC}, the more quantum correlations will be shared between A and the subsystems $\widetilde{B}$ and $\widetilde{C}$, leading to a greater value for $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$. This feature of $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ seems remarkable since it provides a simple method to find the structure of states for which the SSA inequality is saturated by its lower and upper bounds. The concavity property of $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ with respect to its input reveals that a state with vanishing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$ can be realized *only* by those ensembles $\{p_k, \rho_{ABC}^k\}_k$ for which $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}^k) = 0$. We have characterized such ensembles by means of invariance of quantum correlations of ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} under the transformation $B \to \widetilde{B}$ and $C \to \widetilde{C}$. It turns out that $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}^k) = 0$ if and only if the subsystem A lives in a *pure* state, so that it is not affected under purification of ρ_{ABC}. On the other hand, the upper bound $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 2\log d_A$ is saturated if and only if the subsystem A participates in the purification of ρ_{ABC} as possible as it can, i.e., ρ_{ABC} is maximally mixed and factorized from the rest of the system.

Moreover, the approach presented in this Letter explores that the class of states for which the SSA inequality is saturated coincides with those that the K-W inequality is saturated. This generalizes, to the best of our knowledge, the previous results for pure states to those with vanishing $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC})$. Interestingly, the condition $\boldsymbol{T}^{(a)}(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ exhausts such states. In addition, we found that if $S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C) = S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AC})$ then $E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC}) = D^{(B)}(\rho_{AB}) + D^{(C)}(\rho_{AC})$, which is a possible extension of the so-called quantum conservation law previously obtained in [15] for pure states. Due to the widespread use of the SSA inequality in quantum information theory, it is hoped that a quantum correlation description of SSA inequality should shed some light on the several inequalities obtained from it. In particular, our results may have applications in monogamy inequalities, squashed entanglement, Holevo bounds, coherent information, and study of open quantum systems.

The authors would like to thank Fereshte Shahbeigi and Karol Życzkowski for helpful discussion and comments. This work was supported by Ferdowsi University of Mashhad under grant 3/28328 (1392/07/15).

[1] A. Wehrl, Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, 221 (1978).
[2] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2006).
[3] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2010).
[4] O. Lanford and D. Robinson, J. Math. Phys. **9**, 1120 (1968).
[5] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 1938 (1973).
[6] A. S. Holevo, Probl. Inf Transm. **9**, 177 (1973).
[7] B. Schumacher, M. Westmoreland, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3452 (1996).
[8] W. Roga, M. Fannes, and Karol Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 040505 (2010).
[9] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 2629 (1996).
[10] S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 1613 (1997).
[11] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 4153 (1998).
[12] M. Christandl and A. Winter, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 829 (2004).
[13] E. A. Carlen and E. H. Lieb, Lett. Math. Phys. **101**, 1 (2012).
[14] M. Koashi, A. Winter, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022309 (2004).
[15] F. F. Fanchini, M. F. Cornelio, M. C. de Oliveira, and A. O. Caldeira, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012313 (2011).
[16] S. Yang, H. Jeong, and W. Son, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 052114 (2013).
[17] A. Datta, quant-ph/1003.5256.
[18] Z. Xi, X-M. Lu, X. Wang, and Y. Li, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032109 (2012).
[19] D. Petz, Commun. Math. Phys. **105**, 123 (1986).
[20] M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4358 (2002).
[21] P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, and A. Winter, Commun. Math. Phys. **246**, 359 (2004).
[22] L. Zahng, J-D Wu, and S-M Fei, Commun. Theor. Phys. **63**, 427 (2015).
[23] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
[24] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
[25] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**, 6899 (2001).
[26] R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[27] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[28] F. Brandao, M. Christandl, and J. Yard, Commun. Math. Phys. **306**, 805 (2011).